



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/805,493 | 03/22/2004 | Kun-ho Cho | Q74796 | 8391 |

23373 7590 11/27/2006

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

NEGRON, ISMAEL

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2875

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/805,493

Applicant(s)

CHO ET AL.

Examiner

Ismael Negron

Art Unit

2875

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 31 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Claim 13-20 rejected over HASHIMOTO (2002/0024740).
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: 13-20.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-12.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See attached Response to Arguments.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.


Sandra O'Shea
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed on October 31, 2006 has been entered. No claim has been amended, cancelled, or added. Claims 1-20 are still pending in this application, with claims 1, 5 and 13 being independent.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on October 31, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13-20 have been fully considered and are persuasive (see page 4, lines 9-14 of applicant's After-Final response filed October 31, 2006). The rejection of the cited claims has been withdrawn.

4. Regarding the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated HASHIMOTO (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0024740), the applicant argues that the cited reference fails to disclose all the features of the claimed invention, specifically a majority of the beams concentrating on an incident light axis to have a Gaussian distribution.

5. In response to applicant's arguments that HASHIMOTO failed to disclose an apparatus producing a Gaussian light distribution, the applicant is respectfully advised that while the claims of issued patents are interpreted in light of the specification, prosecution history, prior art and other claims, this is not the mode of claim interpretation to be applied during examination. During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. *In re American Academy of Science Tech Center*, 70 USPQ2d 1827 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004). The applicant is further advised that where a prior art apparatus is identical or substantially identical in structure, claimed properties or functional characteristics are presumed to be inherent, and a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977). See MPEP § 2112.01.

In this case, as detailed in the Final Office Action (mailed July 31, 2006), HASHIMOTO discloses in Figure 1 a light source 12, a first cylindrical lens array 14 having a plurality of cylindrical lens cells, a second cylindrical lens array 14 having a plurality of cylindrical lens cells, and a relay lens 19. The first cylindrical lens array 14 divide the light received from the light source 12 into a plurality of light beams which are then combined in the same direction by the second cylindrical lens array 14. The relay lens 19 relays the combined light beams to concentrate them on an incident surface 13. The patented apparatus of HASHIMOTO discloses the claimed structure, and as such was considered to inherently perform the claimed Gaussian light distribution. In addition, the applicant is strongly advised to carefully review the references cited in section 14 of the Office Action mailed February 7, 2006, which disclose additional

Art Unit: 2875

disclose illumination devices, for projection systems, including a light source, first and second cylindrical lens arrays, and a relay lens.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ismael Negron whose telephone number is (571) 272-2376. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra L. O'Shea, can be reached on (571) 272-2378. The facsimile machine number for the Art Group is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications maybe obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) toll-free at 866-217-9197.


Ismael Negron
Examiner
AU 2875


Sandra O'Shea
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800